

EXHIBIT 6

Paper No. ____

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

GOOGLE LLC,
Petitioner,

v.

SINGULAR COMPUTING LLC,
Patent Owner.

Case No. IPR2021-00179

Patent No. 8,407,273

**PETITION FOR INTER PARTES REVIEW
UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 311-319 AND 37 C.F.R. § 42.1 et seq.**

substitute for experience, and vice versa. Goodin, ¶¶ 43-44. If the Board determines the '273 patent is only entitled to its 2012 actual filing date, a POSA in 2012 would have had the same or greater level of skill as in 2009, so the challenged claims would have been obvious for the same reasons discussed herein. Goodin, ¶ 45.

C. Claim Construction

Claim terms are construed herein using the standard used in civil actions under 35 U.S.C. § 282(b), and have been given their ordinary and customary meaning as understood by a POSA in accordance with the specification and prosecution history. 37 C.F.R. § 42.100(b).

D. Prosecution History

The examiner allowed the challenged claims, and the parent application's claims, without substantively discussing any prior art. Ex. 1042, 165-166; Ex. 1002, 164-167.

V. GROUND 1: CLAIMS 1-2, 21-24, 26, AND 28 WOULD HAVE BEEN OBVIOUS OVER DOCKSER

The '273 patent admits LPHDR execution units were known but alleges they were considered “not useful.” '273 patent, 6:58-7:11; Goodin, ¶ 191. The patent purports to encompass the idea “that LPHDR arithmetic is useful in several important practical computing applications” to save power ('273 patent, 16:25-27, 23:65-24:11), but the claims are not limited to methods of use in *particular*